REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-18 and 22 are amended to remove the features relating to authenticated and non-authenticated users, to change "instruction data" to "instructions", and to change "creator" to "user". Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 are further amended to recite a terminal or step for enabling a user to create the instructions and the correspondence relation. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in client terminal 10; Fig. 6; and at page 22, lines 2-20. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Swearingen during the October 30, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. As agreed at the personal interview, the rejections are overcome in view of the following.

I. The Claims Are Definite

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. By this Amendment, the claims are amended to overcome the rejection. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied Reference

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,829,630 to Pajak et al. (Pajak). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Regarding independent claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16, Pajak fails to disclose (1) "instructions (i) identifying a location of document data to be processed and (ii) identifying plural service processes to be executed on the document data"; and (2) "a correspondence relation associating a specific event and one or more of the instructions to be processed when the specific event occurs."

Pajak discloses a system for providing information to customers regarding networked multifunction devices (Abstract). More specifically, Pajak's system can provide such information as metrics and status (col. 2, lines 23-31). The Office Action cites to Fig. 11; col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 7; col. 1, lines 16-19 and lines 27-32; col. 2, lines 23-31; col. 4, lines 60-62; Fig. 12; col. 8, lines 8-20; and col. 8, lines 22-53 as disclosing the various claimed features. However, in operation, Pajak discloses that metrics and status data are collected from remote network devices (Fig. 6, step S200; col. 8, lines 7-12). The data is provided to web objects (Fig. 6, step S300; col. 8, lines 18-21). The data is processed by the web objects to, for example, produce graphs, totals, spreadsheets, etc. (Fig. 6, step S400, col. 8, lines 21-26) and can be provided to users (col. 8, lines 28-32).

Specifically, the Office Action cites to Fig. 11; col. 1, lines 16-19 and lines 27-32; col. 2, lines 23-31, and col. 4, lines 60-62 as allegedly disclosing the claimed storage unit, instruction data (amended to "instructions"), and corresponding relation between a specific event and instruction data corresponding to the specific event. In Fig. 11, Pajak shows a webpage with which a user can initiate Pajak's system. At col. 1, lines 16-19, Pajak discloses that the system uses simple network management protocol (SNMP), a protocol. At col. 1, lines 27-32, Pajak discloses various problems, such as that copiers may run out of supplies, that billing data may need to be reported, etc. At col. 2, lines 23-31, Pajak discloses that Pajak's system automates data collection, analysis, and reporting of status and/or metrics about networked devices. At col. 4, lines 60-62, Pajak discloses that web objects can be stored. That is, in all the cited sections, Pajak does not disclose (1) "instructions (i) identifying a location of document data to be processed and (ii) identifying plural service processes to be executed on the document data"; and (2) "a correspondence relation associating a specific event and one or more of the instructions to be processed when the specific event occurs."

-14-

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/mab

Date: December 12, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461